1. Recommended Action: 
   - Accept as requested
   - X Accept as modified below
   - _Decline

   Effect of EC Vote to Accept Recommended Action: 
   - _X Change to Existing Practice
   - _Status Quo

2. TYPE OF MAINTENANCE

   Per Request: 
   - X Initiation
   - ___Modification
   - ___Interpretation
   - ___Withdrawal

   Per Recommendation: 
   - X Initiation
   - X Modification
   - ___Interpretation
   - ___Withdrawal

   - ___Principle (x.1.z)
   - ___Definition (x.2.z)
   - ___Business Practice Standard (x.3.z)
   - ___Document (x.4.z)
   - ___Data Element (x.4.z)
   - ___Code Value (x.4.z)
   - X _X12 Implementation Guide
   - ___Business Process Documentation

3. RECOMMENDATION

   DATA DICTIONARY (for new documents and addition, modification or deletion of data elements)

   Document Name and No.: 
   - Nomination, 1.4.1
   - Request for Confirmation, 1.4.3
   - Confirmation Response, 1.4.4
   - Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5
   - Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6

   Business Name | Definition | Usage | Condition |
  --------------|-----------|-------|-----------|
   Package ID   | Service Requester assigned identification number identifier used to differentiate between discrete business transactions. | (varies) | (varies) |

* Indicates Common Code
## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester:** El Paso Natural Gas  
**Request No.:** R97022A

### Document Name and No.:
- **Request for Confirmation, 1.4.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier used to differentiate between discrete business transactions.</td>
<td>$ MA$</td>
<td>Mandatory when provided in the nomination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Common Code

### Document Name and No.:
- **Confirmation Response, 1.4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier used to differentiate between discrete business transactions.</td>
<td>$ MA$</td>
<td>Mandatory when submitted in the request for confirmation. This data element is not needed when the Confirmation Requester’s Tracking Identifier is used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Common Code

### Document Name and No.:
- **Nomination, 1.4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the upstream Transportation Service Provider.</td>
<td>$ MA$</td>
<td>This data element is not used for the Pathed Non-Threaded Model Type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the downstream Transportation Service Provider.</td>
<td>$ MA$</td>
<td>This data element is not used for the Pathed Non-Threaded Model Type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Common Code

### Document Name and No.:
- **Request for Confirmation, 1.4.3**  
- **Confirmation Response, 1.4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the upstream Transportation Service Provider.</td>
<td>$ MA$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester:** El Paso Natural Gas  
**Request No.:** R97022A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downstream Package ID</th>
<th>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the downstream Transportation Service Provider.</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Indicates Common Code

**Document Name and No.:** Scheduled Quantity, 1.4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the upstream Transportation Service Provider.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Nomination and when provided in the Nomination document to which this pertains. This data element is not needed when the Nominator’s Tracking Identifier is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the downstream Transportation Service Provider.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Nomination and when provided in the Nomination document to which this pertains. This data element is not needed when the Nominator’s Tracking Identifier is used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates Common Code

**Document Name and No.:** Scheduled Quantity for Operator, 1.4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Package ID</td>
<td>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the upstream Transportation Service Provider.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the confirmation process and when provided in the confirmation document(s) to which this pertains. This data element is not needed when the Confirmation Tracking Identifier is used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Requester:** El Paso Natural Gas  
**Request No.:** R97022A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downstream Package ID</th>
<th>Service Requester assigned identifier which corresponds to the Package ID on the downstream Transportation Service Provider.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the confirmation process and when provided in the confirmation document(s) to which this pertains. This data element is not needed when the Confirmation Tracking Identifier is used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Indicates Common Code

## CODE VALUES LOG (for addition, modification or deletion of code values)

**Document Name and No.:** Nomination Quick Response, 1.4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Code Value</th>
<th>Code Value Description</th>
<th>Code Value Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validation Code</td>
<td>M(C)</td>
<td>ENMQR575</td>
<td>Missing Upstream Package ID</td>
<td>[No definition necessary.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENMQR576</td>
<td>Missing Downstream Package ID</td>
<td>[No definition necessary.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BUSINESS PROCESS DOCUMENTATION (for addition, modification or deletion of business process documentation language)

**Standards Book:** Nominations Related Standards

**Language:** Standard 1.3.24 is modified as follows:

When used, Package ID should be supported for nominating, scheduling, confirming, allocating, and invoicing (sales and purchase), and not required for transportation invoicing.

**Language:** Standard 1.3.27 is modified as follows:

The key should be composed of: service requester contract (Service Agreement), transaction type, upstream party, upstream contract (when applicable), receipt location (as applicable), downstream party (as applicable), downstream contract (when applicable), delivery location (as applicable), package ID, *upstream package ID (where mutually agreed)*, *downstream package ID (where mutually agreed)*, capacity type indicator (where mutually agreed). Upon receipt by a service provider from a service requester of a transaction whose key elements match those previously received by the service provider from the service requester, the service provider should then process the begin date/time and end date/time consistent with the intentions of the standard 1.3.7 and then process the rest of the transaction’s data elements consistent with the applicable standards to determine the business results. When data is not supplied (e.g. is not applicable, is not supported or is not mutually agreed upon) the pertinent portion of the key would be determined to be null.
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: El Paso Natural Gas Request No.: R97022A

TECHNICAL CHANGE LOG (all instructions to accomplish the recommendation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name and No.:</th>
<th>Nomination (1.4.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for Confirmation (1.4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmation Response (1.4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Change:

G850NMST - Nomination (1.4.1)

Data Element Xref to X12

- SI segment - Add “Upstream Package ID” with usage of MA, MA, nu, nu.
- SI segment - Add “Downstream Package ID” with usage of MA, MA, nu, nu.

X12 Mapping

- SI Segment - Add “, Upstream Package ID, Downstream Package ID” to the list of data elements for SI03.
- SI Segment - Add a second paragraph to the “Note” in SI03 that reads “There are 10 1000/234 pairs available in the SI segment. If more than 10 are used, then an additional SI segment should be sent.”

Transaction Set Tables

- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Upstream Package ID. Element name = Upstream Package ID; Usage = MA, MA, nu, nu; Elem 1000 = UP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Upstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Downstream Package ID. Element name = Downstream Package ID; Usage = MA, MA, nu, nu; Elem 1000 = DP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Downstream Package ID

G855NMQR - Nomination Quick Response (1.4.2)

Transaction Set Tables


G850RQCF - Request for Confirmation (1.4.3)

Data Element Xref to X12

- SI segment - Change usage of “Package ID” from C to MA.
- SI segment - Add “Upstream Package ID” with usage of MA.
- SI segment - Add “Downstream Package ID” with usage of MA.

X12 Mapping

- SI Segment - Add “, Upstream Package ID, Downstream Package ID” to the list of data elements for SI03.
- SI Segment - Increase the number of SI pairs through SI21 (from SI11). (i.e. Add SI12, SI13, SI14, SI15, SI16, SI17, SI18, SI19, SI20, SI21.)

Transaction Set Tables

- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Change usage of “Package ID” from C1 to MA. Delete the C1 condition “Mandatory when submitted in the nomination.”.
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Upstream Package ID. Element name = Upstream Package ID; Usage = MA; Elem 1000 = UP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Upstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Downstream Package ID. Element name = Downstream Package ID; Usage = MA; Elem 1000 = DP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Downstream Package ID
# Recommendation to GISB Executive Committee

**Requester:** El Paso Natural Gas  
**Request No.:** R97022A

## G855RRFC - Confirmation Response (1.4.4)

### Data Element Xref to X12
- SI Segment - Change usage of “Package ID” from C to MA.
- SI Segment - Add “Upstream Package ID” with usage of MA.
- SI Segment - Add “Downstream Package ID” with usage of MA.

### X12 Mapping
- SI Segment - Add “, Upstream Package ID, Downstream Package ID” to the list of data elements for SI03.
- SI Segment - Add a second paragraph to the “Note” in SI03 that reads “There are 10 1000/234 pairs available in the SI segment. If more than 10 are used, then an additional SI segment should be sent.”
- SI Segment - Increase the number of SI pairs through SI21 (from SI19). (i.e. SI20, SI21.)

### Transaction Set Tables
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Change usage of “Package ID” from C1 to MA.
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Upstream Package ID. Element name = Upstream Package ID; Usage = MA; Elem 1000 = UP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Upstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Downstream Package ID. Element name = Downstream Package ID; Usage = MA; Elem 1000 = DP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Downstream Package ID

## G865SQTS - Scheduled Quantity (1.4.5)

### Data Element Xref to X12

### Sample X12 Transaction
- SI Segment - Add “, Upstream Package ID, Downstream Package ID” to the list of data elements for SI03.
- SI Segment - Add a second paragraph to the “Note” in SI03 that reads “There are 10 1000/234 pairs available in the SI segment. If more than 10 are used, then an additional SI segment should be sent.”

### Transaction Set Tables
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Upstream Package ID. Element name = Upstream Package ID; Usage = C3, C3, nu, nu; Elem 1000 = UP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Upstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Downstream Package ID. Element name = Downstream Package ID; Usage = C3, C3, nu, nu; Elem 1000 = DP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Downstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add C3 condition that states “Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Nomination and when provided in the nomination document(s) to which this pertains.”

## G865SQOP - Scheduled Quantity for Operator (1.4.6)

### X12 Mapping
- SI Segment - Add “, Upstream Package ID, Downstream Package ID” to the list of data elements for SI03.
- SI Segment - Increase the number of SI pairs through SI17 (from SI13). (i.e. Add SI14, SI15, SI16, SI17.)

### Transaction Set Tables
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Upstream Package ID. Element name = Upstream Package ID; Usage = C2; Elem 1000 = UP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Upstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add a row for Downstream Package ID. Element name = Downstream Package ID; Usage = C2; Elem 1000 = DP; Elem 234 is blank; Description = Downstream Package ID
- “SI 1000/234 Pairs (Sub-detail)” table - Add C2 condition which states “Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the confirmation process and when provided in the confirmation document(s) to which this pertains.”
4. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

a. Description of Request:

Modify nominations related data sets to include two additional fields: upstream package ID and downstream package ID. These two new fields will have the same relationship with the upstream contract identifier and the downstream contract identifier, respectively, as the current package ID has with the Service Requester Contract.

b. Description of Recommendation:

Business Practices Subcommittee

MOTION:
* Delete ‘confirming’ from Standard 1.3.24.
* Change Service Requester to ‘Mandatory’ in Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response.
* Change Package ID to ‘MA/C’ in Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response (‘Mutually Agreeable’ in Request for Confirmation; ‘Conditional’ in Confirmation Response).
* Confirmation occurs at the business party to business party (i.e., Service Requesters and parties identified by Upstream Identifier Code and Downstream Identifier Code, as applicable) level and at lower levels of detail on a mutually agreed basis as between confirming parties.
* The data elements Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID should be added to the Nomination (except for the Pathed Non-Threaded model), Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity documents on a mutually agreed basis as between all parties (Service Requester, Transportation Service Provider and other confirming parties).

Sense of the Room: May 21, 1997
19 In Favor
3 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services
13 3 3
Opposed: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services
3 2 3 1

MOTION:
BPS Recommends R97022 be transferred to IR/Technical for further development.

Sense of the Room: May 22, 1997
17 In Favor
0 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services
13 Producers
Opposed: End-Users LDCs Pipelines Producers Services
3 2 3

Information Requirements Subcommittee (July 15, 1997)

* #1 BPS Recommendation:
“Delete ‘confirming’ from Standard 1.3.24.”
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: El Paso Natural Gas Request No.: R97022A

IR Implementation:
Standard 1.3.24 is modified as follows: When used, Package ID should be supported for nominating, scheduling, confirming, allocating, and invoicing (sales and purchase), and not required for transportation invoicing.

• #2 BPS Recommendation:
  “Change Service Requester to ‘Mandatory’ in Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response.”

IR Implementation:
Service Requester is currently ‘MA’ in Request For Confirmation and ‘C’ in Confirmation Response. May not be applicable as ‘M’ at all levels. Several in the room disagreed with the BPS Recommendation and wanted to refer back to BPS for further development. IR noted the following issues:

ISSUE: The problem lies in the interpretation of parenthetical in fourth bullet (see #4 BPS Recommendation below). Is only one of the three required? Or only Service Requester and Upstream Identifier Code? Or only Service Requester and Downstream Identifier Code?

ISSUE: Service Requester should be ‘C’ based on party you are confirming with and involves limited title transfer tracking. When confirming at highest level with point operator, you are providing information about the Service Requester that the operator is not entitled to. This may apply only to parties that do tiered confirmations. (This issue applies to #2 and #4 BPS Recommendations.)

• #3 BPS Recommendation:
  “Change Package ID to ‘MA/C’ in Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response (‘Mutually Agreeable’ in Request for Confirmation; ‘Conditional’ in Confirmation Response).”

IR Implementation:
Package ID is currently 'C' in the Confirmation Response.

• #4 BPS Recommendation:
  “Confirmation occurs at the business party to business party (i.e., Service Requesters and parties identified by Upstream Identifier Code and Downstream Identifier Code, as applicable) level and at lower levels of detail on a mutually agreed basis as between confirming parties.”

IR Implementation:
See note on #2 above.

• #5 BPS Recommendation:
  “The data elements Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID should be added to the Nomination (except for the Pathed Non-Threaded model), Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity documents on a mutually agreed basis as between all parties (Service Requester, Transportation Service Provider and other confirming parties).”
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: El Paso Natural Gas Request No.: R97022A

IR Implementation:

ISSUE: Why are Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID not included on the Pathed Non-Threaded Nomination model? This is because the Package ID in the non-threaded portions are analogous to the Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID. IR suggests that the Nomination data set be revised to delete Package ID from non-threaded portions and replace it with Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID.

ISSUE: Should Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID be on the Allocation?

ISSUE: Market Settlement Task Force did not make revisions to the Allocation to implement Version 1.1 of Standard 1.3.24 (i.e., to change usage of Package ID to ‘M’). Package ID is currently ‘MA’ in the Allocation. Do the same issues exist on the Allocation as on the Confirmation? (See notes regarding #2 and #4.) Should this be considered along with the Role Level Code on the Allocation (R96131)?

All of the issues noted under R97022 will be referred to BPS. IR will request expedited processing. R97022 will be the first item on next IR agenda following development of BPS Recommendation. No opposition on sending the above ISSUEs to BPS.

Business Practices Subcommittee

The motion was made and seconded to send the following instruction to the IR as further explanation of the original instructions’s intent:

The data element Service Requester is mandatory in the Request for Confirmation document, and in addition, upstream ID is mandatory in the Request for Confirmation document for receipt transactions (the usage code would be conditional based on the transaction being a receipt transaction), and downstream ID is mandatory in the Request for Confirmation document for delivery transactions (the usage code would be conditional based on the transaction being a delivery transaction).

Sense of the Room: October 9, 1997  7 In Favor  3 Opposed  2 Abstentions

Segment Check (if applicable):

In Favor:  ___End-Users  ___LDCs  ___Pipelines  ___Producers  ___Services

Opposed:  ___End-Users  ___LDCs  ___Pipelines  ___Producers  ___Services

Business Practices Subcommittee (October 23, 1997)

DISCUSSION:

...Mr Lander offered drafting an ‘a’ and ‘b’ model. In the ‘a’ and ‘b’ model, the upstream package ID on the downstream party’s nomination would be the value of the upstream party’s package ID. The downstream package ID on the upstream party’s nomination would be the value of the downstream party’s package ID. ...
Business Practices Subcommittee

A motion was made to adopt the ‘a’ and ‘b’ method as the means of implementation of upstream and downstream package IDs on a mutually agreed basis with the instructions that it is the intent of the Business Practices Subcommittee that all aspects of R97022 be handled simultaneously by the EC.

Sense of the Room: October 30, 1997  11 In Favor  0 Opposed  8 Abstentions

Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor:   End-Users  LDCs  Pipelines  Producers  Services
Opposed:   End-Users  LDCs  Pipelines  Producers  Services

Information Requirements Subcommittee

* #1 BPS Recommendation (5/21):
“Delete ‘confirming’ from Standard 1.3.24.”

IR Implementation:
Standard 1.3.24 is modified as follows: When used, Package ID should be supported for nominating, scheduling, confirming, allocating, and invoicing (sales and purchase), and not required for transportation invoicing.

* #2 BPS Recommendation (5/21):
“Change Service Requester to ‘Mandatory’ in Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response.”

IR Implementation:
Revise Usage of Service Requester in Request For Confirmation and Confirmation Response to 'Mandatory'. Delete Condition in the Confirmation Response. Update paper examples for Request For Confirmation and Confirmation Response to include these two data elements which are now mandatory.

* #3 BPS Recommendation (5/21):
“Change Package ID to ‘MA/C’ in Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response (‘Mutually Agreeable’ in Request for Confirmation; ‘Conditional’ in Confirmation Response).”

IR Implementation:
-- Package ID is currently 'C' in the Confirmation Response.
-- Revise Condition to: Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Request for Confirmation and when provided in the Request for Confirmation document to which this pertains.
-- Revise Usage of Package ID in the Confirmation Response to ‘MA’. Delete Condition. IR rationale:
  -- Package ID has Usage of 'SO' in the Nomination. Package ID may not be present in the Nomination and therefore, would not be available for the confirmation process.
  -- Package ID cannot be ‘C’ in the Confirmation Response because the receiver of an unsolicited Confirmation Response may not use/support Package ID. The ‘MA’ Usage means that both parties agree to use the Package ID in the confirmation process.

-- Revise Usage of Package ID to ‘MA’ in Request For Confirmation. Delete Condition.
-- Do not need Reduction Reason for Package ID because existing ”No Corresponding Nomination” will suffice.
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: El Paso Natural Gas Request No.: R97022A

* #4 BPS Recommendation (5/21):
“Confirmation occurs at the business party to business party (i.e., Service Requesters and parties identified by Upstream Identifier Code and Downstream Identifier Code, as applicable) level and at lower levels of detail on a mutually agreed basis as between confirming parties.”

IR Implementation:
Add the following language as the first paragraph of the Technical Implementation of Business Process for the Request for Confirmation and Confirmation Response:
“Confirmation occurs either at the service requester and upstream identifier code level or at the service requester and downstream identifier code level. In addition, confirmation may occur at lower levels of detail on a mutually agreed basis as between confirming parties.”

* #5 BPS Recommendation (5/21):
“The data elements Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID should be added to the Nomination (except for the Pathed Non-Threaded model), Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response and Scheduled Quantity documents on a mutually agreed basis as between all parties (Service Requester, Transportation Service Provider and other confirming parties).”

BPS Recommendation (10/30): The Upstream Package ID on the downstream party’s nomination would be the value of the upstream party’s package ID. The downstream package ID on the upstream party’s nomination would be the value of the downstream party’s package ID.

IR Implementation:
* Add the following data elements to Nomination, Request for Confirmation, Confirmation Response, Scheduled Quantity and Scheduled Quantity for Operator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Package ID</th>
<th>Upstream Package ID</th>
<th>Downstream Package ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>MA1</td>
<td>MA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom QR</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC</td>
<td>MA *</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>MA *</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQOP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: El Paso Natural Gas Request No.: R97022A

* - Is a change from previous Usage.

MA1 - This data element is not used for the Pathed Non-Threaded Model Type. (This note will be added to the Condition column.)

C1 - Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the Nomination and when provided in the Nomination document to which this pertains. This data element is not needed when the Nominator’s Tracking Identifier is used.

C2 - Mandatory when mutually agreed to in the confirmation process and when provided in the confirmation document(s) to which this pertains. This data element is not needed when the Confirmation Tracking Identifier is used.

Additional Implementation:
* Revise definition of Package ID as follows: "Service Requester assigned identification number identifier used to differentiate between discrete business transactions." This was done to correspond to definition for new data elements, Upstream Package ID and Downstream Package ID.

Additional Implementation:
Add two error messages to Nomination Quick Response:
  -- Missing Upstream Package ID
  -- Missing Downstream Package ID

No definition is necessary for these error messages.

Additional Implementation:
Revise Standard 1.3.27 as follows: The key should be composed of: service requester contract (Service Agreement), transaction type, upstream party, upstream contract (when applicable), receipt location (as applicable), downstream party (as applicable), downstream contract (when applicable), delivery location (as applicable), package ID, upstream package ID (where mutually agreed), downstream package ID (where mutually agreed), capacity type indicator (when applicable). Upon receipt by a service provider from a service requester of a transaction whose key elements match those previously received by the service provider from the service requester, the service provider should then process the begin date/time and end date/time consistent with the intentions of the standard 1.3.7 and then process the rest of the transaction’s data elements consistent with the applicable standards to determine the business results. When data is not supplied (e.g. is not applicable, is not supported or is not mutually agreed upon) the pertinent portion of the key would be determined to be null.

Sense of the Room: December 9, 1997
8 In Favor
0 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: ___End-Users ___LDCs ___Pipelines ___Producers ___Services
Opposed: ___End-Users ___LDCs ___Pipelines ___Producers ___Services

Technical Subcommittee

Sense of the Room: December 19, 1997
7 In Favor
0 Opposed

Segment Check (if applicable):
In Favor: ___End-Users ___LDCs ___Pipelines ___Producers ___Services
Opposed: ___End-Users ___LDCs ___Pipelines ___Producers ___Services
Executive Committee (February 12, 1998)

... The motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded to:

Adopt the recommendation with the above corrections.

... The original motion failed with 21 affirmative votes, four votes opposed, and only one producer voting in favor. The motion failed.

Mr. Wallenhorst made a motion to:

Adopt the recommendation with the change to revert to the original usage for Service Requester in the Request for Confirmation and the Confirmation Response (page 4 of the recommendation).

The Information Requirements Subcommittee and the Technical Subcommittee will review the recommendation in light of conforming changes. The recommendation with conforming changes will be brought back to the EC for review at a subsequent meeting to ensure that all conforming changes are identified prior to member ratification.

The second motion passed, and the standards modifications were adopted with 22 votes in favor and two abstentions. There were at least two positive votes from each segment. It will not go out for ratification until April, after the conforming changes are identified.

... A motion was made to reconsider R97022 and have service requester added back into the adopted standard as mandatory ... Mr. Buccigross made the motion to withdraw his prior motion, and have his first motion considered as request R97022B. His motion passed with no dissension.

Information Requirements (March 17, 1998)

Make necessary revisions to Recommendation form to revert to original usage for Service Requester in the Request for Confirmation (MA) and Confirmation Response (C). Conforming changes to recommendation form based on changes made at the Executive Committee meeting of February 12, 1998.

The recommendation was reviewed and the required changes reviewed. Changes were proposed and made to the completed recommendation form (as appropriate) for completeness and consistency with the EC adoptions as noted above. The revised form will be presented to the EC at a future meeting for approval. No objections noted.

Technical Subcommittee (April 2, 1998)

Make necessary revisions to Technical Change Log section in Recommendation form to revert to original usage for Service Requester in the Request for Confirmation (MA) and Confirmation Response (C). Conforming changes to recommendation form based on changes made by the Information Requirements Subcommittee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of the Room: April 2, 1998</th>
<th>8 In Favor</th>
<th>0 Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment Check (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Favor: End-Users</td>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>Pipelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed: End-Users</td>
<td>LDCs</td>
<td>Pipelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION TO GISB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Requester: El Paso Natural Gas  Request No.: R97022A


c. Business Purpose:

These two data elements will provide the same differentiation among upstream and downstream transactions as specified in Standard 1.2.5.

By adding these two data elements, the upstream and downstream party will be able to confirm the nomination at the same level as it was nominated.

d. Commentary/Rationale of Subcommittee(s)/Task Force(s):